

SOME OBSERVATIONS on Sir THOMAS HYDE PAGE's Letter to Sir Martin Folkes, dated the 10th of March 1794: Which Letter has been generally distributed by the Agents of the Opposers of the EAU BRINK BILL.

SIR THOMAS HYDE PAGE's Argument, in his Pamphlet of 1777, which is the Origin of the present Controversy, is founded on the Case of the *Rhine*, as described by a French Author; and this is brought forward by him as a Case in Point, from its Resemblance to that of the *Ouze*.

The *Rhine*, when it approaches the Sea, divides itself into Three Branches, each Twice larger than the Mother River; but these Streams, in Consequence of their Breadth, are silted up so much, that they cannot altogether discharge the Water brought down by the Mother River so fast as they receive it.

The present State of the *Ouze* is certainly very similar to that of the *Rhine*. Its Width below German's Bridge is extended to more than Three Times its Dimensions above; and this wide Part is in Consequence so silted up, that it also cannot discharge the Upland Waters so fast as it receives them.

Sir THOMAS proceeds to state the French Author's Opinion of improving the Outfall of the *Rhine*, as an Example for the *Ouze*, which is, to re-unite the Three Streams into One of a proper Dimension.

So far Sir THOMAS and the Promoters of the *Eau Brink Cut* agree, as both Parties advise a Contraction of the wide Part of the River.

Sir THOMAS recommends this Contraction to be made by Fascine Banks, carried through the wide Part of the Channel.

The

The PROMOTERS of the *Eau Brink Cut* recommend it to be effected by turning the River into a new Channel, cut through solid Land, in a Course only Half as long as that of Sir THOMAS's proposed Embankment.

In Objection to Sir THOMAS's Project, they say, that a Fascine Embankment carried through wide Waters, upon a Foundation of loose Sand, liable to shift with every Ebb and every Flood, implies an uncertain and possibly an unlimited Expence, and has little Probability of ultimate Success.

In Defence of the *Eau Brink Cut*, they say, that its Expence is known and moderate; that it has every Probability of lasting for Ages, with no other than usual Repairs; and that, being only Half as long as Sir THOMAS's projected Channel, it will discharge the same Body of Water in Half the Time.

But the Hazard to which *Lynn* Harbour is exposed, if any such there is, must be the same in both Projects; for, should Sir THOMAS succeed in carrying his Fascine Banks through the Gulph between German's and *Lynn*, in such a Manner as to confine the Current of the Ouze between, the Remainder of that vast Flat, which is now a Receptacle for Tide Water, must speedily silt up, as all stagnant Reservoirs of muddy Water have constantly been found to do.

The Effects of both Projects then will certainly be the same in destroying the Receptacle of the Flood Waters, which now ebb through *Lynn* Harbour; but in Point of Drainage Sir THOMAS's will evidently be less efficacious than the *Eau Brink Cut*, because it will not discharge so much Water in a given Space of Time.

Respecting Sir THOMAS's grand Project, of embanking all the Main Rivers and Side Drains, as high as Ely, this, as he justly acknowledges, was borrowed by him from Van Westerdyke, who proposed it to the Proprietors more than One hundred Years ago.

The Advantage of this Plan is self-evident to every Man who has thought on the Subject; but the Cost of it is so enormous, that no One has yet ventured to give an Estimate of its Amount; and indeed it is not probable that any One (except a Dutchman, accustomed to the unmerciful Taxation of a Republican



publican Government, or a Military Engineer, employed, as Sir THOMAS was when he surveyed the Level, by the Master General of the Ordnance, and used to the Expenditure of Public Money, under the Article of Ordnance Extraordinaries) would have seriously recommended it to Proprietors already charged with Drainage Taxes, nearly to the full Value of their Property.

Before we can learn the Mode employed by Sir THOMAS to erect Fascine Embankments in Langston Harbour, it will be necessary for him to give more accurate Information than he has done, of the Manner in which it was communicated to the Public: His Quotation of the Transactions of the Arts and Sciences, in his last Letter, is, like the Insertion of Mr. SMEATON's Name in his First, an Inaccuracy. As for the Fascine Works at Dover and at Reculver, they have no more Reference to the Matter in Question, than a Fascine Battery would have, as the Foundations on which they were laid are not loose and shifting Sands, but Earth made solid by a Duration of Ages.

The AUTHOR of the above Observations has no Self-interest in the Business; but having maturely considered all that has been said and written on the Subject, is fully convinced of the Necessity of the *Eau Brink Cut* to preserve an extensive valuable Country from Destruction, and wishes to prevent the Adoption of a chimerical Plan now brought forward by the Opposers of the Bill, with a View to frustrate the Execution of a work *likely* (nay, it might be said, *certain*) to produce an Abundance of Good, and no Injury.

It is hoped that no Objection will be made to this Paper being anonymous, when it is considered that Sir THOMAS HYDE PAGE is not inclined to investigate the Business as a Civil Engineer, but has proposed to adopt the short and easy Way of a Military one*, to put an End to the Argument—by blowing out the Brains of his Opponent.

* See
Page
Letter.

A FRIEND TO AGRICULTURE
and COMMERCE.

London, 16th April, 1794.

16th April, 1794.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

Sir Thomas Hyde Page's

LETTER

TO

Sir Martin Folkes,

UPON THE

FAU BRINK CUT,

